

Mark C. Mao, CA Bar No. 236165
 Beko Reblitz-Richardson, CA Bar No. 238027
 Erika Nyborg-Burch (admitted *pro hac vice*)
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
 44 Montgomery St., 41st Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94104
 Tel.: (415) 293-6800
 mmao@bsflp.com
 brichardson@bsflp.com
 enyborg-burch@bsflp.com

James Lee (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 Rossana Baeza (admitted *pro hac vice*)
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
 100 SE 2nd St., 28th Floor
 Miami, FL 33131
 Tel.: (305) 539-8400
 jlee@bsflp.com
 rbaeza@bsflp.com

Amanda K. Bonn, CA Bar No. 270891
SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
 1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
 Los Angeles, CA 90067
 Tel: (310) 789-3100
 Fax: (310) 789-3150
 abonn@susmangodfrey.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

William Christopher Carmody
 (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 Shawn J. Rabin (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 Steven M. Shepard (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 Alexander Frawley (admitted *pro hac vice*)
SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
 1301 Avenue of the Americas,
 32nd Floor
 New York, NY 10019
 Tel.: (212) 336-8330
 bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com
 srabin@susmangodfrey.com
 sshepard@susmangodfrey.com
 afrawley@susmangodfrey.com

John A. Yanchunis (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 Ryan J. McGee (admitted *pro hac vice*)
MORGAN & MORGAN
 201 N. Franklin Street, 7th Floor
 Tampa, FL 33602
 Tel.: (813) 223-5505
 jyanchunis@forthepeople.com
 mram@forthepeople.com
 rmcgee@forthepeople.com

Michael F. Ram, CA Bar No. 104805
MORGAN & MORGAN
 711 Van Ness Ave, Suite 500
 San Francisco, CA 94102
 Tel: (415) 358-6913
 mram@forthepeople.com

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

CHASOM BROWN, WILLIAM BYATT,
 JEREMY DAVIS, CHRISTOPHER
 CASTILLO, and MONIQUE TRUJILLO
 individually and on behalf of all similarly
 situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

Case No.: 5:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK

**[REVISED PROPOSED] ORDER
 GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION
 FOR LEAVE TO AMEND COMPLAINT
 (R. CIV. P. 15(a))**

The Honorable Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers
 Courtroom 1 - 4th Floor
 Date: March 15, 2022
 Time: 2:00 p.m.

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiffs’ Rule 15(a) motion for leave to file their proposed Third Amended Complaint.

“The court should freely give leave [to amend] when justice so requires.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2). “The Supreme Court has stated that ‘this mandate is to be heeded.’” *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1130 (9th Cir. 2000) (quoting *Foman v. Davis*, 371 U.S. 178, 182 (1962)). Similarly, the Ninth Circuit has “repeatedly stressed that the court must remain guided by the underlying purpose of Rule 15 . . . to facilitate decision on the merits, rather than on the pleadings or technicalities.” *Id.* at 1127 (alteration in original). “This leave policy is applied with extreme liberality.” *Hughes v. S.A.W. Ent., Ltd.*, 2018 WL 6046461, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 19, 2018).

“The Supreme Court has identified four factors relevant to whether a motion for leave to amend should be denied: undue delay, bad faith or dilatory motive, futility of amendment, and prejudice to the opposing party.” *Meaux v. Nw. Airlines, Inc.*, 2006 WL 8459606, at *1 (N.D. Cal. July 17, 2006) (citing *Foman*, 371 U.S. at 182). “As this circuit and others have held, it is the consideration of prejudice to the opposing party that carries the greatest weight.” *Eminence Cap., LLC v. Aspeon, Inc.*, 316 F.3d 1048, 1052 (9th Cir. 2003) (citing *DCD Programs, Ltd. v. Leighton*, 833 F.2d 183, 185 (9th Cir. 1987)). “Absent prejudice, or a strong showing of any of the remaining *Foman* factors, there exists a *presumption* under Rule 15(a) in favor of granting leave to amend.” *Id.* (emphasis in original). As “[t]he non-moving party[, Google] bears the burden of demonstrating why leave to amend should not be granted.” *Clayborne v. Chevron Corp.*, 2020 WL 11563087, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 2, 2020) (citing *Morongo Band of Mission Indians v. Rose*, 893 F.2d 1074, 1079 (9th Cir. 1990)).

Google cannot meet its heavy burden to show why leave should be denied. Google has not established prejudice because Plaintiffs’ amendment merely conforms the class definitions to the evidence produced in discovery, and Plaintiffs do not seek any additional discovery on the basis of this amendment. Nor has Google established that Plaintiffs are guilty of undue delay or bad faith or that amendment would be futile.

1 But to alleviate any Google concerns, the Court orders that Plaintiffs may not rely on their
2 newly revised class definitions to do any of the following:

- 3 • Seek additional 30(b)(6) testimony
- 4 • Seek additional document productions
- 5 • Request that Google supplement any interrogatory responses or its initial
6 disclosures
- 7 • Seek to extend any case deadlines

8
9 Plaintiffs' motion for leave to amend is therefore **GRANTED**. Plaintiffs' Third Amended
10 Complaint, filed with their motion for leave to amend, is now deemed filed.

11
12
13
14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15
16 DATED: _____

17 Honorable Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers
18 United States District Judge
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27